

**Sense-of-the-Senate Resolution on Erosion of Tenure  
Promotion and Tenure & Professional Relations Committees  
March 5, 2018—Second Reading & Vote**

Whereas an institution comprised principally of tenured faculty protects academic freedom, the creation of new knowledge, shared governance, and curricular integrity;

Whereas an institution comprised principally of tenured faculty resists the threat of the erosion of tenure both locally and nationally, enhancing academic freedom, shared governance, curricular integrity, and to increasing research, scholarly, and creative activity of the faculty;

**Whereas** President Nellis has publicly stated his desire to raise the research profile of Ohio University;

**Whereas** budget constraints on American universities and the deterioration of university missions (being driven by enrollment, agendas of state and federal agencies, concerns primarily on academic generation of revenue) have accelerated erosion of tenure across the nation and at Ohio University through increased numbers of non-tenure track lines;

**Whereas** the AAUP has reported from the national view “that in the past, financial and intellectual security enabled the faculty to carry out the public trust in both teaching and research, sustaining a rigorous system of professional peer scrutiny in hiring, evaluation, and promotion”; however, “today the tenure system has all but collapsed”\*;

**Whereas** AAUP reports that in “opposition to this trend, a new consensus is emerging that it is time to stabilize the crumbling faculty infrastructure. Concerned legislators and some academic administrators have joined faculty associations in calling for dramatic reductions in the reliance on contingent appointments, commonly urging a maximum of 25 percent”\*; thus, the recommendation is for tenure-line faculty to not drop below 75% of the overall number of faculty;\*\*

**Whereas** the 2016 Ohio University Institutional Research data indicate that Ohio University is well above the 25 percent maximum contingent faculty and below the 75% of total Group 1 faculty.\*\*\* (See below for more information.)

**Be it resolved that** the University and its academic departments and programs prioritize hiring on the tenure track;

**Be it resolved that** the University strive to hire no more than 25% of its faculty outside of the tenure track;\*\*\*\*

**Be it resolved that** the University use its ability to hire on a variable workload distribution (Faculty Handbook II.A.1.B) to protect both the research and teaching mission of academic departments, *with* the expectation that all tenure track faculty contribute to some extent to all areas (TRS) of the mission of the university;

**Be it resolved that** as appropriate to the mission of departments, schools, and colleges, faculty and administrators provide the means by which to consider teaching-intensive or research intensive tenure

lines, with adjusted expectations in the other two areas of the academic mission, through planning, promotion and tenure criteria;

**Be it resolved** that those responsible for hiring requests and decisions will hire, whenever possible, tenure track faculty at differential workloads to meet the needs of the department/school before defaulting to non-tenure track faculty. While letters of offer to incoming faculty need to clearly specify the workload expectations under which they will begin employment, such agreements should not prohibit a renegotiation of workload distribution if such a renegotiation is warranted, both during the tenure clock and post-tenure;

**Be it resolved** that departments ensure that promotion and tenure criteria reflect actual workload distribution of faculty, including teaching-intensive, research-intensive or balanced faculty lines as appropriate to their mission;

**Be it resolved** that the Senate and Provost's Office seriously consider mechanisms for converting appropriate non-tenure track to teaching or research-intensive tenure track lines.

Sources

\*<https://www.aaup.org/report/tenure-and-teaching-intensive-appointments>

Please note: the AAUP uses the term contingent for all non-tenure line faculty

\*\*Ohio University IR: 2016 Athens Campus Total Faculty =1403; Group I = 711. 1,052 is 75% of total faculty.

2016 Regional Campus Total Faculty=644; Group I=113. 483 is 75% of total faculty.

Please note: Over the past several years the number of Group I has stayed relatively stable. However; there has been a sharp increase in faculty hired off the tenure line.

\*\*\*<https://www.ohio.edu/institres/faculty/index.html>

-20 years ago, G1 constituted 85.25% of all full-time faculty (tenure track and non-tenure). Today, after steady decline, they make up only 71.41%.

-Compared to all faculty (full- and part-time together), G 1 made up 59.63% in 1996/97, while they are only at 42.22% today.

-Over the past 20 years, Group 1 have flat-lined (zero growth from 1996/17 to 2016/17). However, between 1996/97 and 2006/07, Group 1 faculty grew from 879 to 949. After that, their number fell sharply to 840 in 2013/14 and then grew back to almost the same value as 20 years ago, 882.

-Compared to this, full-time non-tenure (G2 and G4) grew more or less steadily from 152 in 1996/17 to 353 in 2016/17 (today 2.3 times as many as in 1996/97).

-All non-tenure faculty (both full and part time) together have also more than doubled in the past 20 years from 595 to 1207.

(Source: OU Institutional Research)

\*\*\*\*We recognize that this is a high bar, one that is probably quite literally impossible for Regional campuses and very difficult to imagine in reality for the Athens campus. Yet, "strive" is a word that asks for accountability in the attempt to reach the goal; We should still "strive" for it though obstacles will be numerous.